

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/704,535	11/03/2000	Rudy Bonefas	35825-164588	5575
7590	09/02/2004		EXAMINER	
ASHOK K. MANNAVA 281 MURTHA STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22304			AVELLINO, JOSEPH E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/704,535	Applicant(s)	BONEFAS ET AL.
Examiner	Joseph E. Avellino	Art Unit	2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2004.  
2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-23,34-46,48 and 49 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) Claim(s) 1-10,24-33,47 and 50-62 is/are rejected.  
7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-10, 24-33, 47, and 50-62 are pending in this examination. Claims 11-23, 34-46, 48, and 49 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to nonelected inventions.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-6, 8, 24-29, 31, 47, 50-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al. (US Pre Grant Pub. 2002/0133573) (hereinafter Matsuda).

3. Referring to claim 1, Matsuda discloses a computer readable data storage medium storing software for supporting a plurality of servers in an intelligent messaging network (i.e. a network 201), the software comprising:

a first code segment handling registration (automatic configuration, network addressing, service discovery) of NOA (networked office architecture) servers and clients with the intelligent messaging network, wherein registration comprises storing a server id (fully qualified domain name) and a server type (i.e. service definitions, as seen in ¶'s 86-95) for the first server in a database storing server ids and server types for the plurality of servers (e.g. abstract; p. 5, ¶ 47-49; p. 8-9, ¶ 83-114);

a second code segment for connecting NOA clients/servers to one another (e.g. abstract; p. 8, ¶ 83-95) (it is understood that if a NOA client can utilize the services of another NOA client, then it is inherent that they are connected to one another);

a third code segment encapsulating communication between NOA clients (e.g. abstract).

Matsuda does not specifically disclose enabling communication between servers, however Matsuda does disclose that if a NOA server is not configured as a DHCP server offering configuration settings, it is registered as a NOA client, therefore it would lead one of ordinary skill to believe that multiple servers can communicate with one another using the system described in Matsuda, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide for encapsulating communications between servers to the system of Matsuda to provide for enhanced communications abilities and for information sharing abilities.

4. Referring to claim 2, Matsuda discloses the first code segment (i.e. registration process) specifies a server class (i.e. a server priority) and a server type (p. 6-7, ¶ 56, 61).

5. Referring to claim 3, Matsuda discloses the first code segment (i.e. registration process) specifies an IP address (p. 7, ¶ 65-66).

6. Referring to claim 4, Matsuda discloses the third code segment (i.e. network communication technique) generates a standard packet for communications between the servers (i.e. an HTTP packet since the NOA architecture is based on an HTTP network connected to the Internet 201) (p. 3, ¶ 37; p. 4, ¶ 40).

7. Referring to claim 5, it is well known in the art that HTTP packets which the NOA architecture of Matsuda utilizes includes a packet length (i.e. "Content-Length: XXXX").

8. Referring to claim 6, it is well known in the art that HTTP packets which the NOA architecture of Matsuda utilizes includes a server ID (i.e. an IP address of the server) so that it is known the source or destination of the packet).

9. Referring to claim 8, Matsuda discloses a code segment encrypting and decrypting messages (p. 10, ¶ 126-127), however does not specifically state generating acknowledgement messages, processing the acknowledgement messages, and compressing and decompressing messages, however it is well known in the art that acknowledgement messages (known as ACK's) can be sent from destination to senders if a particular segment or message has not been received, and it is then inherent that both the destination computer and the sender computer can process the ACK message to determine what, if any, action must be done to rectify the situation (i.e. retransmit a segment, restart transmission, etc.). It is further common knowledge that code segments which compress and decompress messages is well known and expected in

the art to save transmission processing and reduce overall bandwidth on the network communication link. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide for generating and processing ACK messages as well as compressing and decompressing messages to further reduce overall server processing and increase efficiency while reducing congestion over the network.

10. Referring to claim 50, Matsuda discloses searching the database based on server type to identify the second server, the second server being of a server type that the first server desires to connect with (p. 9, ¶ 97-105).

11. Referring to claim 51, Matsuda discloses facilitating a handshake procedure determining a validity of a connection between the first server and the second server (p. 9, ¶ 102-107).

12. Referring to claim 52, Matsuda discloses the server types are associated with functions performed by the plurality of servers (p. 8-9, ¶ 83-114).

13. Referring to claim 53, Matsuda discloses the server types comprise protocol gateway servers (i.e. fax servers), message router servers (i.e. doc\_retrieval servers) and back-end servers (calendar\_schedule and retrieval servers) (p. 8, ¶ 86-95).

14. Referring to claim 54, Matsuda discloses the server class is associated with a network access protocol for a network connecting a client to the first server (p. 6-7, ¶ 56, 61).

15. Referring to claim 55, Matsuda discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Matsuda does not specifically disclose encapsulating a network access protocol used to transmit data from a client device to the first server such that the network access protocol is transparent to the second server receiving the data from the first server. However it is well known that wireless browser-enabled cellular phones use the WAP (wireless application protocol) in order to connect to the Internet, this WAP signal is sent to a gateway which encapsulates this request into a standard HTTP GET request, thereby allowing the ability to connect to the internet. By this rationale it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to incorporate encapsulating a network access protocol used to transmit data from a client device to the first server such that the network access protocol is transparent to the second server receiving the data from the first server because it would allow cellular users the ability to utilize the system, thereby increasing customer base and providing more of a market share to the system.

16. Claims 24-29, 31, 47, 56-62 are rejected for similar reasons as stated in the claims above.

Claims 7, 9, 10, 30, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda in view of Bell et al. (USPN 6,044,081) (hereinafter Bell).

17. Referring to claim 7, Matsuda discloses the computer-readable data storage medium as stated in the claims above. Matsuda does not disclose encapsulating a transport header, notifying a sender of a success or failure of a transmission, segmenting messages over a pre-determined length into message segments, assembling messages segments into messages, resending messages not ACK'ed, detecting duplicate message segments, and detecting duplicate messages. Bell discloses:

encapsulating a transport header (MAC frame header) (col. 20, lines 24-33); notifying a sender of a success or failure of a transmission (it would have been obvious to incorporate a failure notification mechanism to the sender when a frame check sequence error is detected to reduce bandwidth by halting transmission of unnecessary message segments and to retransmit pertinent segments) (col. 21, lines 20-30);

segmenting messages over a pre-determined length into message segments (encapsulation) (e.g. abstract; col. 20, lines 23-65);

assembling messages segments into messages (de-encapsulation) (col. 21, lines 30-51);

pacing a transmission of messages larger than a pre-determined number of segments (i.e. buffering messages and transmitting them in a queue) (col. 20, lines 20-25);

Bell does not specifically state detecting duplicate message segments or detecting duplicate messages, however does disclose that if a new message sequence number is received before the necessary last segment of the previous message, it will abort processing and return an error (col. 21, lines 20-30). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide code to detect duplicate message segments and detect duplicate messages to the system of Matsuda-Bell to increase efficiency of the system by not wasting server processing time dealing with previously sent messages or segments.

18. Referring to claim 9, Matsuda discloses the computer-readable data storage medium as stated in the claims above. Matsuda does not disclose encapsulating a communication layer. Bell discloses encapsulating a communication layer (the Office takes the term communication layer to mean formatting a higher level message to be transmitted over a network) (col. 20, lines 23-65). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Bell with Matsuda to provide an efficient bandwidth connection while providing a path from every node to every other node within a private network without requiring multiple physical connections for each node as supported by Bell (col. 8, lines 30-35).

19. Referring to claim 10, it is well known in the art that application specific messages can be processed by servers (i.e. serving a web page, a CGI script, SOAP execution module, etc.) to provide services required by the application to the client. Furthermore, it is well known in the art that specific servers may compress messages as a form of encryption in order to provide an enhanced level of security as well as reducing used bandwidth on a communication link. Matsuda discloses code providing special security services (i.e. passwords and database updating) (p. 10, ¶126-128).

20. Claims 30, 32, and 33 are rejected for similar reasons as stated in the claims above.

***Response to Amendment***

21. Applicant's arguments filed October 14, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

22. Applicant argues in substance that, (1) the combination of Matsuda and Bell do not disclose storing a server id and server type.

23. As to point (1), see rejection above for the specific locations as to how Matsuda discloses the newly added limitation.

***Conclusion***

24. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph E. Avellino whose telephone number is (703) 305-7855. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JEA  
August 30, 2004



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100